

1 Tammy B. Webb (SBN 227593)
2 tbwebb@shb.com
3 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
4 One Montgomery, Suite 2700
5 San Francisco, California 94104
6 Telephone: (415) 544-1900
7 Facsimile: (415) 391-0281

8 Steven A. Zalesin (Admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 sazalesin@pbwt.com
10 PATTERTON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP
11 1133 Avenue of the Americas
12 New York, New York 10036-6710
13 Telephone: (212) 336-2000
14 Facsimile: (212) 336-2222

15 Attorneys for Defendants
16 THE COCA-COLA COMPANY and
17 COCA-COLA REFRESHMENTS USA, INC.

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 AYANNA NOBLES and JULIA HUGHES,
21 individually and on behalf of all others
22 similarly situated,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 COCA-COLA REFRESHMENTS USA, INC.,
26 and THE COCA-COLA COMPANY

27 Defendants.

28 Case No. 3:13-cv-05017-SI

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO FILE
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'
COMPLAINT AND REQUESTING
CONTINUANCE OF INITIAL CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Susan Illston

27 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6.1(b), Plaintiffs Ayanna Nobles and Julia Hughes ("Plaintiffs")
28 and Defendants The Coca-Cola Company and Coca-Cola Refreshments USA, Inc., ("Defendants")
(collectively referred to as the "Parties") through their respective counsel hereby stipulate as follows:

27 WHEREAS, on November 18, 2013, Defendants filed a motion to relate case with
28 *Engurasoff v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-03990-JSW ("Engurasoff") (Dkt.
No. 10);

STIPULATION

CASE NO. 3:13-cv-05017-SI

1 WHEREAS, as set forth in that motion, Plaintiff's Complaint arises from the same set of
2 operative facts as the *Engurasoff* complaint;

3 WHEREAS, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss in *Engurasoff* on November 22, 2013;

4 WHEREAS, Defendants believe that Plaintiff's Complaint is not legally viable for the same
5 reasons asserted in its motion to dismiss in the *Engurasoff* action; WHEREAS, the deadline for
6 Defendants to answer or otherwise move with respect to the Complaint is currently December 30,
7 2013;

8 WHEREAS, the Initial Case Management Conference is currently set for February 5, 2014;

9 WHEREAS, no other time modifications have been made to this case, whether by stipulation
10 or court order.

11 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the Parties through
12 their respective attorneys of record that:

- 13 1. The deadline for Defendants to respond to the Complaint is extended to two weeks after a
14 ruling is entered on the motion to dismiss filed in *Engurasoff v. The Coca-Cola Company*,
15 *et al.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-03990-JSW, currently set to be heard on February 21, 2014.
- 16 2. The Initial Case Management Conference currently set for February 5, 2014 shall be
17 continued to a later date, after a decision is made on the *Engurasoff* motion to dismiss.

18
19 Dated: December 19, 2013

By: /s/ Reginald Von Terrell
Reginald Von Terrell
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

20
21 Dated: December 19, 2013

By: /s/ Tammy B. Webb
Tammy B. Webb
Attorneys for Defendants

22
23 Pursuant to L.R. 5-11(i)(3), I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained
24 from the other signatories.

25
26 By: /s/ Tammy B. Webb
27 Tammy B. Webb
28

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER

2 The Court hereby orders that:

3 1. Defendants' response to the Complaint will be due two weeks after the decision is made
4 on the motion to dismiss in *Engurasoff, et al. v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al.*, Case
5 No. 3:13-cv-03990-JSW.

6 2. The Initial Case Management Conference set for February 5, 2014 is continued to
7 3/21/14 @ 2:30 P.M..

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated: 12/19/13

10 
11 THE HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE